

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 32 to 45 are added. Claims 1-45 are now in the application.

Claims 24-31 stand withdrawn as not readable on the elected invention, which is, the Examiner's Group I, please see paper No. 6 and No. 9. New Claims 32 and 33 are assignable to Group IV and new Claims 34 to 45 to Group I.

Examiner Truong is thanked for the interview granted Applicants' representative on June 12, 2003. The following includes the presentation made at that interview.

The independent claims are 1, 24 and 25, the latter two standing withdrawn. They are, however, amended in conformance with the amendments to claim 1.

Claim 1 is amended to recite definitely that the method is one in which the reactants consist essentially only of those specified to yield a condensation product of only these reactants. Bases appears in the original claim itself as well as in the original specification as a whole.

Claim 3 is amended to remove an unnecessary recitation.

Claim 6 and others are amended to remove inappropriate multiple dependency.

The acronyms DHA and DIA are replaced by their full names.

Claims 18 and 19 are amended to change "different to" to "different from". Also, conventional Markush terminology is introduced for definiteness.

Further, "preferably 6 to 20" for "n" is removed.

Claims 32 and 33 represent alternatives embraced within original Claim 30. They are assignable to the Examiner's Group IV.

Claims 34 and 35 recite the preferred range for n removed from Claims 18 and 19.

Claim 36 recites the "e.g." recitation removed from Claim 3.

Claims 37 and 38 find basis in Example 2, page 17 and elsewhere.

Claims 39 and 40 find basis in Example 3, page 18 and elsewhere.

Claim 41 finds basis at page 3, lines 18 and 19 and elsewhere.

Claims 42 and 43 finds basis in Example 15, page 32.

Claims 44 and 46 find basis on pages 3 to 6 and on page 7 last two paragraphs and elsewhere as the examples, such as Examples 3 and 9.

The specification is amended in the paragraph at page 2, line 7 to correct a citation. Copies of the Journals cited in that paragraph are supplied. The Yamamoto et al citation, page 1, line 19 is the same as Moon et al of record.

### THE REJECTION

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1-2, 5-6 and 8-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Martin or JP 60316631 (JP 06-316631) are requested.

Martin discloses a substituted dihydroanthracene diamine reacted with a co-reactant in Example VII, col. 8, and in the general disclosure at col. 3, lines 12 to 35. The dihydro compound has 6 aromatic double bonds, unlike the 7 in the parent compound. It is therefore not a reactant within the scope of the claims, and also the condensation described in Example 8 and in the inventions broadly stated require another reactant which is not one of those specified in the subject claims. Such reactants are excluded by the subject claims.

With regard to the condensation reaction specified in Example VI, col. 7, referred to in the interview, the reaction involves ethylene, col. 7, lines 41 to 43, excluded by the subject claims and no oligomer or polymer product is disclosed of the diaminoanthracene itself. The product of Example VI is a substituted dihydroanthracene, note the name at column 8, line 3.

Moreover, with respect to claim 2 in particular, which requires a vacuum and no solvent, such conditions are obviously not met in Example VI and the condensation that occurs in Example VII occurs in the sealed tube at atmospheric pressure.

Claims 1 and 2, as here amended, are therefore not anticipated. Claims 5, 6 and 8-10 depend from Claim 1 are similarly not anticipated.

As for JP 06-316631, the cited Abstract does not disclose any diamino reactant and the here submitted computer print out of the entire patent supplied by the Japanese Patent Office does not either, please see paragraph [0013].

Three monoamino-anthracenes are listed in that paragraph. It is noted that none of them have an amino substituted in the 9 or 10 positions.

Accordingly, neither does JP 06-316631 anticipate Claim 1 as presently amended nor the rejected claims dependent thereon.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1, 3, 5-6, 8-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by JP 600135420 or JP 600135419 or JP 600036519 of record on 1449 are also requested. The abstracts are relied upon.

JP 600036519 appears to be the basic document of the three. It discloses the reaction of an aromatic diamine which can be 1,5-diaminoanthracene (it is noted that 9,10 is not disclosed in the Abstract) with a polyhydroxy aldehyde. The latter is excluded by the subject claims. There is therefore no anticipation.

The remaining two are variants of the JP 600036519 document. The 60135420 document discloses a two stage reaction. The diamino anthracene of both is the 2,3 isomer. The 60135419 document includes boric acid. Both require a hydroxyl aldehyde reactant.

Hence, they do not anticipate the rejection claims.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over GB 2350617 of record on 1449 are also requested.

The GB document names the present applicants as the inventors and is assigned to the same assignee as the present application. It was published 06/12/2000, which is properly

Application No. 09/991,649  
Reply to Office Action of April 18, 2003

read as the 6<sup>th</sup> of December, 2000. The subject application was filed on November 26, 2001.

The GB document is therefore a publication by Applicants themselves within year a of the subject application filing date and accordingly is not prior art as to the subject claims.

It is also noted that Applicants' priority date in the UK of November 28, 2000 antedated the GB publication date. The priority claim and receipt of the priority document have been acknowledged.

The rejected claims are therefore allowable over the GB document.

At the interview, the matter of possible double patenting over the two U.S. patents listed in the statement of related case submitted with the IDS of March 31, 2003 was also considered. U.S. 6,153,726 corresponds to the above noted GB document. The Examiner concluded at the time there was no double patenting issue.

The new Claims 34-45 are all assignable to the elected Group I. All depend directly or indirectly from Claim 1 and are therefore similarly allowable.

Favorable action is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Norman F. Oblon', written over a horizontal line.

Norman F. Oblon  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 24,618

Milton N. Stermann  
Registration No. 27,499

I:\ATTY\MNS\216236US-AM.DOC